

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, 1, 2, 6-10, 12-15 and 17-20 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the original claims and the specification at paragraph [0027]. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Whipple and Lin at the interview held November 12 and by Examiner Whipple during the telephone interview conducted November 14, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interviews as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' separate record of the interviews.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11-13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032251 to Rhoads et al. ("Rhoads"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claim 1 recites, "... collecting a plurality of document identifiers on a first medium; receiving and storing in a memory on a second medium the plurality of collected document identifiers, and a user identifier identifying a unique user; associating

each document identifier with at least one of the plurality of documents stored in at least one of the plurality of document repositories, the document repositories different from the first and second media...." Claims 15 and 17 recite similar features. Rhoads fails to teach each and every feature of amended claims 1, 15 and 17.

Rhoads teaches, in paragraphs [0020]-[0022] that a user gives a business card or other element, imprinted with an Internet address, to a card recipient during a transaction. The card recipient then can access secondary information on a Web site, related to the information on the business card or the transaction conducted when the business card was exchanged, by using a computer to decode the Internet address information on the business card. The secondary information is typically a Web site customized by the user, as discussed in paragraphs [0033]-[0036]. Rhoads, therefore, teaches that a business card is used to provide secondary information from a single source, in this case, a Web site, to a user, without allowing the user to choose which Internet address or addresses may be imprinted on the business card.

However, Rhoads fails to teach at least the step of collecting a plurality of document identifiers on a first medium that is subsequently received and stored in the memory of a second medium, which associates the document identifiers to documents in document repositories so that the documents can be sent to a user. As was discussed during the personal interview and subsequent telephone interview, Rhoads fails to teach the additional step of collecting a plurality of document identifiers on a first medium and then having a second medium receive and store the document identifiers. Therefore, Rhoads does not teach each and every feature of amended claims 1, 15 and 17.

Claims 1, 15 and 17 are not anticipated by Rhoads. Claims 2, 6-9, 11-13, 16, 18 and 19 depend from claims 1, 15 and 17 and, thus, also are not anticipated by Rhoads. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Rhoads and Aldstadt

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rhoads in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149765 to Aldstadt et al. ("Aldstadt"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, Rhoads fails to teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. Further, Rhoads provides no reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the disclosure of Rhoads to encompass all the features of the claimed invention. Specifically, Rhoads at least fails to provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a medium for collecting a plurality of document identifiers on a first medium because Rhoads merely discloses that business cards can be optically scanned and then the device that scanned the business card is directed to a web-based document. The "document identifiers" disclosed in Rhoads are optical codes (such as websites) printed on business card that connects the recipient of the business card to secondary information associated with the information on the business card. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have had a recipient collect a plurality of the "document identifiers" on a medium. Therefore, Rhoads does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1.

Further, Aldstadt is not applied to address the discrepancies of Rhoads as to amended claim 1. Therefore, Rhoads and Aldstadt, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1.

Claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads and Aldstadt, individually or in combination. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads and Aldstadt, individually or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rhoads and Aldstadt as applied to claim 3 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0089766 to Needham ("Needham"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads and Aldstadt, individually or in combination. Further, Needham is not applied to address the discrepancies of Rhoads and Aldstadt as to amended claim 1. Therefore, Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1.

Claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham, individually or in combination. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham, individually or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Rhoads and Needham

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 10, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rhoads as applied to claims 1 and 2 in view of Needham. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 17 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads. Further, Needham is not applied to address the discrepancies of Rhoads as to amended claims 1 and 17. Therefore, Rhoads and Needham, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claims 1 and 17.

Claims 1 and 17 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads and Needham, individually or in combination. Claims 5, 10, 14 and 20 variously depend from claims 1 and 17 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads and Needham,

individually or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Nicolas A. Brentlinger
Registration No. 62,211

JAO:NAB/kjl

Date: November 17, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037